

# Ray and Mary LaFontaine's "Journalism"

Ray and Mary LaFontaine say they are journalists. In fact they are scandal-mongers, making their scandals up as they go. Their book, Oswald Talked, is a case in point. That title is a lie. Oswald did not "talk." He was not, as they also made up, a police ~~snitch~~ <sup>informer</sup> who snitched on a minor stolen gun case.

The subtitle of their book is also a lie. It is "The New Evidence in the JFK Assassination." In fact there is ~~nothing~~ <sup>nothing</sup> "new" in what they claim as new and it has nothing at all to do with the JFK assassination.

There is no limit to the other false claims they make. For example, also on their dust cover, that their "book provides more new documented evidence than

any book in twenty years." We'll see how false this is. Also false is their next claim, that they do "not rely on unreliable witness testimony [sic]" which they in fact depend on entirely.

Their publisher, Pelican,, under the utterly false heading "No More Conspiracy ~~speculations~~ <sup>speculations</sup> and suspicions" adds additional falsehood in stating that their's is "the Kennedy book that names the players in the cover-up and how they did it."

A bigger lie is not easily made up.

The book has nothing at all to do with the JFK assassination. It has not a word about who covered what ~~assassination~~ <sup>assassination</sup> evidence up or how or why they did that.

The book is not in fact about the assassination at all. As in the past, the LaFontaines were ~~seeking~~ <sup>seeking</sup> sensation, the cheapest sensation; and having ~~gotten~~ <sup>gotten</sup> nowhere with such irrelevancies as those Dealey Plaza ~~tramps~~ <sup>my</sup> who had nothing at all to do with Dealey Plaza or the assassination they have this ~~invented~~ <sup>substitute for fact and reality</sup> book for their sensation.

It was easy for them because they began as and remain subject-matter ~~ignor~~ <sup>ignor</sup> ignoramuses. About which it is easy to write at book length, they are that ig-

norant, that self-important in their ignorance and that stupid in what they write. Their ~~arrogance~~ <sup>arrogance</sup> and ~~stupid~~ <sup>stupid</sup> stupidity are unequalled in the field.

When they are criticized they find it necessary to attack those who criticize them,

2

as they do Steve Bochan. They ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ did not respond to my pre-publication criticism as they could not, so they opt the coward's choice and lie about me in their book, to which I could make no response. If they did not know they were lying in what they said about me they are even more ignorant than from their ~~writing~~ writing they appear to be.

It is past time for the La Fontaines to have <sup>have</sup> learned about throwing stones from glass houses.

Two years ago they had a lengthy article in the Washington Post mis-titled "The Fourth Tramp." It supposedly is about John Franklin Elrod, who was arrested separately from those three who were tramps <sup>Elrod</sup> and was not a tramp. He was a cook.

In that article the LaFontaines restructured the Dallas city jail to have it conform to what they had made up, that Elrod heard <sup>perceived that Oswald was</sup> ~~Oswald confess to what the~~ LaFontaines wrote their work of mis-titled fiction about, being a police snitch. In that article the ~~jail~~ jail's maximum security section was where those in it saw anyone using the elevators, which is false, and that block had a thin back wall through which all <sup>LaFontaines</sup> ~~this~~ ~~the~~ ~~was~~ made up could be heard, also false.

As a record for history, not for publication, I wrote the Post about the errors in the LaFontaine "news" journalism." Jefferson Morely, who sold the Post that LaFontaine bill of <sup>goods</sup> ~~the~~ ~~geos~~, asked if he could send it to them.

"Of course," I told him, adding, "and I'll respond in writing to anything they may say about what I wrote."

Then my friend Jim Leavelle, the retired Dallas detective who was handcuffed to Oswald when Ruby killed him, ~~sent~~ sent me a sketch of that jail. He also stated that the back wall of that block was of exceptionally thick steel and that words could not be heard through it. <sup>Morely sent them that too.</sup>

The LaFontaines did not write me a word about what I <sup>sent</sup> wrote the Post and the Post sent them. They revised what they had made up about the jail to give a <sup>eliminate the impossible</sup> ~~different version~~ <sup>CIT</sup> that is still only a fabrication.

They also abuse the decent and concerned ~~Silvia~~ Silvia.

Odio, <sup>This</sup> which is also <sup>information</sup> essential to their fabricated claim to fame and fortune. Their fiction is that she held back from the government and in effect prevented a planned invasion of Cuba that would have gotten rid of Cuba. The last part is not even childish. The first part is indecent beyond exaggeration.

Remember their claim <sup>not</sup> to use "theories," not to use what they refer to as "~~the~~ unreliable 'witness' testimony?" So they say of Odio, now in her grandmother years, that she "had betrayed her parents to the Cuban authorities and was in reality the mistress of Fidel Castro" (page 267). This they attribute to what an enemy of Odio's wrote in a book, her claimed source being "a private detective" she hired in her campaign ~~and~~ against odio.

This is an outrageous indecency and with Odio's husband, ~~small~~ <sup>from Cuba</sup> children and their flight ~~it~~ was also an obvious impossibility.

Sloppy in their writing as in their thinking the La Fontaines also say of Odio the exact opposite when they wrote of her ~~was~~ that "With ~~the~~ imprisoned parents and a lost society to avenge it would have been contemptible for a person of spirit not to try to do something" (page 241).

The LaFontaines' are not small minds to be hobgoblined by consistency. <sup>with Odio</sup> They have it both ways.

What they say of me and what I wrote of Odio they have in a note:

32. In his apparent zeal to protect Silvia as one of his star witnesses to conspiracy, Harold Weisberg quotes her verbatim from the Secret Service report—right up to the mention of Cisneros, at which point Weisberg interposes himself to suppress the tell-tale name. Thus: "She advised him [Machann] the only information she could provide on the people who visited her was, 'in effect, what she had already said'" (emphasis added) (*Oswald in New Orleans*, 287). Here Weisberg entirely misleads his readers. What she actually told Machann was anything but "what she had already said." (page 425)

There was and I had to read to "protect"

4  
~~join~~ Their first sentence is <sup>2</sup> ~~a knowing~~ <sup>lie</sup> a deliberate lie, and what is not a lie in the rest is irrelevant to what I was writing about.

I brought Odio and her testimony to light in the first book on the Warren Commission and the assassination, my 1965 "hitewash: The Report on the Warren Report". I carried this farther in my next book, Whitewash II, which was published in 1966. Remember what the LaFontaines claimed about going to first sources? Well, they do not have either of these books in their bibliography (page 454).

It is at the end of Chapter 11 of "hitewash", titled "The False Oswald," that I was the first to write about Odio and her <sup>sworn</sup> testimony (pages 153-4).

And, contrary to what the LaFontaines says I said, I did say "It was not Oswald" who visited her.

Odio was not my ~~prime~~ "star witness to conspiracy" as the LaFontaines make up and I was not trying to "protect her" in what I actually wrote. <sup>There was no such need.</sup> Nor did I quote all of that Secret Service report "verbatim" ~~as~~ as they also say "right up to the mention of Cisneros." <sup>and</sup> ~~They then say that I~~ "interposed" myself to suppress ~~that~~ that tell-tale name." It has meaning in only the childish LaFontaine fabrication of the coming invasion of Cuba and Castro's overthrow they <sup>imagine</sup> ~~image~~ was to be pulled off by 14 students!

What the LaFontaines refer to is on page 287 of Oswald in New Orleans. But what I was writing about is stated at the beginning of that part of that book: "What can we know about the men in the story of The False Oswald?" (page 260).

I was writing about the falsification of Oswald and could not have been more specific in stating this in all three of those books. I <sup>refer</sup> ~~it refers~~ to the one who visited Odio not as Oswald <sup>and</sup> not as an assassination conspirator but as "The False Oswald."

In the plain English that is more than justified, the LaFontaines lied knowing they were lying because they could not respond to my criticisms and were out to get revenge. So, their <sup>trusting</sup> ~~readers~~ <sup>are victims too,</sup> also paid for it.



Essential in  
is the  
that  
Their nonsense about ~~an~~ allegedly aborted invasion of Cuba was to have been  
led by the student, Fermin de ~~Go~~ Goicochea, Sanchez. They were to have been "armed by ~~the~~  
weapons stolen from a large U.S. Army post at Kileen, Texas, Fort Hood (page 277).

Not only was it childish to think that with the <sup>failure of the</sup> full force of the Bay of  
Pigs invaders and the arms <sup>the</sup> CIA gave them and the advance bombing by  
air that the ragtag DRE could have pulled off what the LaFontaines make up - <sup>Castro</sup> Castro  
had in the interim been rearmed extensively by the USSR.

They quote the CIA as on this childish <sup>in</sup> childish alleged invasion plan they  
inflate so enormously as calling it "somewhat <sup>u</sup> romantic" (page 294). At the  
same point they also quote the CIA as saying that support for it "would not be  
possible."

That kid stuff also <sup>a</sup> called for the CIA to provide a <sup>firm</sup> ~~arm~~ outside the United  
States, which the CIA would not do (page 294).

It is all preposterous, less sensible that childishness, but vital in this LaFontaine  
fabrication.

It is, supposedly, about this theft of Army weapons that Oswald, in the La  
Fontaine fabrication, "talked" to the police leading to the arrest of some of  
those <sup>y</sup> gunrunners and the <sup>end</sup> ~~aid~~ of the <sup>a</sup> alleged coming invasion of Cuba.

Not having the ~~needs~~ of the LaFontaines the Dallas Morning News did not  
attribute the arrest of those men to Oswald's talking. Its story, not in the LaFontaine  
book, reads:

The chase started, patrolman J.B. Allen and J.R. Sales said, when they saw  
the northbound car ~~run~~ a red light at Allen. When they ~~tried~~ to stop the  
car, it speeded north at speeds up to <sup>80 m</sup> ~~80~~ miles an hour. Five blocks away  
at Hall and Junius, the contraband laden ~~vehicle~~ convertible plunged  
between two autos halted for a red light. ~~It sideswiped~~ sideswiped both and  
squealed on toward Gaston,

Where it "crashed head on into a utility pole.

There <sup>was</sup> ~~was~~ a total of five weapons in that car, hardly enough for the minuscule  
<sup>and only imagined</sup>

6  
planned invasion of ~~the~~ fourteen students.

and with these kind of amateurs running those guns, not only was no snitch required, the actualities prove there was no snitch. Not Oswald, ~~Not~~ any other. *Out of nothing at all the LaFontaines make it all up.*  
That "new evidence" of which the determinedly ignorant LaFontaines are so proud ~~is~~ was not new <sup>long</sup> before they were bitten by the assassination bug. It also was not brought to light by their derringdo researcher, <sup>"Then"</sup> ~~let~~ <sup>u</sup> Silicaon Valley ~~and~~ cavalry, their "eminently sane" her <sup>o</sup> and guru, "Bill Adams, the man who started it all with his discovery of the August 11, 1964 FBI report on John Franking Elrod," (page 94 and elsewhere)

In the LaFontaine version it was necessary for Adams to fight a series of <sup>m</sup> ~~Freedom of Information Sections~~ <sup>Act efforts</sup> to be ~~bring~~ this "new" and sensational dope to light.

All Adams or anyone else had to do was go into the FBI's public reading room and ask to see it, or writing <sup>e</sup> the FBI and ask for copies because all of it and more had been made public as a result of two of my FOIA lawsuit <sup>of</sup> and that

long before that same bug bit Adams, too.

(I doubt you will want to publish them but I <sup>ish</sup> ~~enclose~~ some of these FBI reports.) <sup>in the FBI's</sup> It is specific that the FBI's investigation of those "tramps" was forced by my giving it pictures of them and of the sketch said to have been of the assassin of ~~the~~ Martin Luther King, Jr., which was virtually trace <sup>d</sup> from one of those pictures. ("emphis file 44-1987- Sub b, serial 56).)

That investigation, the third for which <sup>assassination</sup> was responsible in that one year, 1968, made it obvious that those ~~tramps~~ had no relevance at all <sup>so</sup> ~~and~~ neither I nor anyone else, not <sup>cheap</sup> ~~being~~ sensation seekers or mangers, had any interest in going any further and waiting any time on learning the ~~names~~ <sup>of</sup> those irrelevant winos. <sup>which</sup> ~~the~~ <sup>is</sup> what they were.

With regard to ~~Franking~~ Elrod's alleged knowledge of the assassination, the FBI states unequivocally that he "emphatically denied ~~any~~ knowledge of the assassination or the involvement of Ruby in killing Oswald." (FBI 105-82555-4726) (C)

7  
Elrod was drunk. He turned himself in, ~~armed~~ as he was with an illegal sawed-off shotgun, because he ~~was~~ <sup>if he had</sup> afraid he'd kill his wife with it. ~~Nothing~~ at all to ~~do~~ <sup>my</sup> with the assassination in any way at all.

All of these ~~and~~ other records like them were forced out of secrecy by <sup>my</sup> Civil Actions 75-1996, 78-0322 and 78-0420, all long before any of this Adams heroism and LaFontaine fabrication based on ~~them~~ <sup>it. These records</sup>. ~~They~~ have been ~~for~~ freely available to all writing in the field at my home, as even ~~Gerald~~ Posner <sup>for twenty years</sup> attests, and in the FBI's public reading room beginning in the summer of 1976.

It is based on the LaFontaine <sup>is</sup> fabrications that they have their book in which they also claim, basic as it is in their book, that Elrod also talked.

Like Oswald, he did not and the LaFontaines know he did not and would not!

What they write about as the pinnacle of modern United States journalism is the scandal-loving/supermarket-tabloid TV supposed news programs. They are so proud of their "journalism" on ~~Hard~~ <sup>Hard</sup> Copy for November 16, 1993, <sup>it was</sup> attractive to ~~Hard~~ <sup>Hard</sup> Copy because of the coming thirtieth assassination anniversary. They write in ~~their~~ <sup>their</sup> book that in preparing for this show, which they, "Desperado ~~Production~~ Productions" as they call themselves, produced.

On it they ~~aired~~ <sup>they have in their book</sup> Elrod. And he steadfastly, refused absolutely, ~~to~~ <sup>to</sup> say a single thing other than that he could get in trouble. he refused absolutely to say what in their book they claim he said. <sup>it is</sup> In the book they state their interviews filled thirty-three cassettes. And in all that <sup>time</sup> they could not get Elrod even to hint at what they base their book on stating that he said.

My copy of that transcript was provided <sup>by</sup> their second <sup>major</sup> source, from their book, <sup>my friend</sup> my friend of more than thirty <sup>years</sup> years, Paul Hoch. Hoch. Paul had nothing to do with what the LaFontaine's wrote and it is conspicuous they have no plug from him on their book.

In plain ~~English~~ <sup>my</sup>, as I state to begin with, the LaFontaines make it all up and in addition lie with determination.

Oswald did not talk <sup>and</sup> there was no need for him to have for what happened.

8  
There was no need for him or for anyone <sup>else</sup> ~~else~~ to have "talked," <sup>or</sup> ~~been~~ any kind of police snitch,

Elrod not only did not say what the LaFontaines base their book on his having said, he steadfastly refused to say that or anything <sup>K</sup> lie it when pressured to for hours. Those tapes of which they <sup>LaFontaines</sup> boast represent sixteen and a half hours that were taped <sup>of all the time they leaned on Elrod.</sup> alone.

With the LaFontaine record of defaming all who do not agree with them <sup>the use of less pointed</sup> they do not deserve words being less pointed. They are, without any question, liars. They make up what they want to have believed and do that throughout their trashy book. They began and they remain subject-matter ignoramuses.

To go into <sup>all</sup> there is of this in their book would take book length but <sup>I add a</sup> ~~little~~ <sup>few</sup> ~~illustrations~~ <sup>about</sup> make the point. Like their other plain, straightforward lie of Oswald snitching to the FBI about a Cuban camp near New Orleans. That is <sup>baseless</sup> all conjecture or conjecture where it is not all straight-out fabrication.

They have Guy Banister still working for the FBI "with contract assignments," something they made up, the FBI not having them. <sup>He</sup> Banister left the FBI because he was not up to its medical standards. <sup>He</sup> did not last long on the New Orleans police, either. <sup>Moreover,</sup> But there was no sense at all in their conjecture that "Oswald was in New Orleans to keep tabs on Banister." Not for the FBI and not for anyone

else. That he was <sup>prepared</sup> ~~equipped~~ for any such work is also make up from nothing. That kind of job requires skills and <sup>of</sup> ~~and~~ training Oswald did not have. <sup># All childish story-book stuff.</sup> (page 132).

It is also a ~~straight~~ straightforward lie that Banister "provided an upstairs office to store leaflets and other paraphernalia," (page 133). In all Oswald had a mere thousand sheets of paper, what could easily be carried in one hand, plus a few, very few, FPCC pamphlets. For these and his two picket signs (which the LaFontaines know nothing about and ~~say~~ say nothing about) he had no need for any office or other space. His home was not ~~over~~ cramped by them and he did not take <sup>of it to</sup> ~~all~~ any one picketing. When he was all finished he had some left over. They attracted ~~little~~ little interest.

9  
Utterly lost without conjecture the LaFontaines conjecture what did not happened and Oswald did not intend to happen, "that Oswald would develop his seemingly collaborative <sup>a</sup>relationship with the DRE," the "relationship" that did not exist. Also <sup>and a non-existing</sup> the relationship they make up out of nothing that "may have been planned by [Warren] de Bruceys" (page 133).

To ~~pen~~"penetrate" the one-man DRE of Carlos Bringuier? Who could not have been more public in all his many futilities? But the LaFontaines say that is what Oswald did, "penetrate the Bringuier organization for the FBI" (page 133). The FBI had ~~had~~ no such need, not that it was not impossible ~~away~~, not that Oswald <sup>and not that Bringuier knew anything or meant anything.</sup> made any such effort of any kind. He went to Bringuier's twice only. The second time Bringuier was not even there. Some "penetration" that is! With great value and ~~importance~~ importance for the FBI, too!! <sup>If more silly kids talk (who did not report!)</sup>

So, they have Oswald what they call "the Pontchartrain informant" (and they have "word ~~exactly~~ gradually started to seep through via Banister's ~~saxophone~~ <sup>which also did not report</sup> FBI grapevine," all imagined, ~~non-existing~~ and none serving any purpose if it had existed except to assassination of nuts who get carried away with their own imaginations and ignorance,

What actually happened is that there was no snitch on that matter of the raid about which the LaFontaines write with their usual lack of any knowledge at all and with what they make up, lacking even the knowledge ~~and~~ required to make up anything <sup>in that area</sup> sensible at all.

There were three so-called Cuban camps. At none was there any training.

The two that were ~~known~~ known were in small houses. By sources ~~are~~ the cooperative St. Tammany Parish sheriff's office and deputies; the man who had one of those camps, Rudolph <sup>and his men girl friends</sup> (Ricardo) Davis; and the man who actually reported the danger he and others face <sup>d/</sup> that led to the raid about which the LaFontaines ~~are~~ write so glibly knowing nothing at all about it.

The McLaney of mafia gambling operations in Cuba had a small summer place on the other side of <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ Pontchartrains from where he lived in New Orleans.

It was off of Pontchartrain drive, between Slidell and Lacombe. <sup>on a large lot</sup> It was a small frame house (with no outbuildings, not ~~even~~ the tiniest shed. I know. I was there and I <sup>photo</sup>graphed it. While I was there the man who lived next door told me about seeing some Cubans ~~here~~ bringing explosives <sup>in</sup> on an open U-Haul trailer behind an auto. Then, as they cleaned <sup>up</sup> the place that had not been used for a long time up and they burned the trash they raked up they started a grass fire that could have made all the ~~explosives~~ explosives they brought in blow up and wreck the neighborhood. It is from this reasonable fear that this man who lived next door reported that danger of the authorities, thus the "raid."

David <sup>such house</sup> had another place of which he told me. The Sheriff took pictures of it for me when I ran out of time.

~~And~~ <sup>one</sup> of the deputies told me about an unknown <sup>camp</sup> that was in a woods along the lake shore. ~~From~~ From it small fast boats set out for Cuba loaded with small arms. They ran a regular courier service.

~~There was no~~ <sup>for use in Cuba</sup> ~~and they did not~~ need any weapons to be stolen from the army (as the La Fontaines just made up. The CIA had plenty of sources, as all agencies do and as unofficial people also can have if they want them. There is <sup>it</sup> ~~quite~~ a trade in what goes boom.

<sup>La Fontaines</sup> ~~There is~~ <sup>as where</sup> ~~political ignorance~~ is displayed throughout the book. They find covering the <sup>assassination</sup> truth up justified because "who knows what might have resulted ... from an imprudent discovery ~~the~~ of an international conspiracy" of "agents of Fidel (Castro with the suspected assassintance of the KGB" (page 246).

<sup>4</sup> Castro was going to kill his only real insurance policy, Kennedy, who solved the 1962 missile crisis by guaranteeing to protect Cuba against any invasion, a guarantee even Khrushchev could not give him?

But if this were not ~~so~~ <sup>sw</sup> so, what "assistance" would have been required of the KGB? <sup>Still again, children writing a cheap novel.</sup>

~~of~~ The USSR that was and for a ~~year~~ year had been trying to work out agreements with the United States to reduce tensions and armaments, <sup>It and Kennedy sought</sup> seeking ~~peace~~ peace in which

Kennedy and Khrushchev exchanged about forty letters in *their joint quest.*

For those who are going to make up history <sup>as</sup> they seek ~~a~~ fame and fortune from it, including those who have high opinions of their genius and do not need *and the understanding* fact that they do not have ~~anyway~~, ignorance sure helps. *Tolerance alone* ~~made~~

*find the pain able for* made possible what the LaFontaines wrote in this book, a book whose publisher did not ~~have~~ the once-traditional peer reviews for honest nonfiction. This book ~~is~~ would have been laughed back to Pelican by any authentic subject expert *u*

*There is one way and only one way in which "Oswald Talker."*

That is in ~~describing~~ *out* proving that the LaFontaines are self-important ponies who make up their book ~~of~~ of nothing but conjectures and overt lies because, being subject-matter ignoramuses, there is no other way in which they can ~~exp~~ exploit and commercialize the assassination *They* and make up ~~more~~ scandals *tragic* as even they can sell ~~and~~ with that selling corrupt our history ~~even more than~~ the government did not.

~~and~~ all that they boast is "new" is new to them only, *having* been public almost twenty years before they their "Silicon Valley cavalry," not knowing it was all public, made the ~~valiant~~ *needless* efforts the LaFontaines *exaggerate and* attribute to him to bring it to light for them!

What was all freely available long before the ~~the~~ assassination *bug* bit them and they were ~~all~~ too ignorant to know it, including ~~that~~ that "cavalry" of theirs who with them has yet to *distinguish* between the ends of horses.

The LaFontaines prove all over again that it is not possible to write responsibly or even honestly about the assassination and its investigations without knowing and knowing the meaning of the information that has been disclosed. Those *who* ~~no~~ *2* written without this preparation, even with good intentions, cannot avoid deceiving and misleading the people and burying the truth even deeper in what inevitably becomes their quest for fame and fortune as they exploit and commercialize this great tragedy in our history. They rip off the mind while they rip off the purse.